

REMARKS AND ARGUMENTS

Information Disclosure Statement

1. Applicant discloses to the Examiner under 37 CFR 1.56, and 37 CFR 1.97-1.98, as revised (1135 OG 13) and effective March 16, 1992, the information listed on the attached form PTO/SB/08A. This information may be found to be material to this invention under the current applicable patent law and as interpreted by the US PTO Rules, as cited above. Review and consideration of the listed references/information during substantive examination of this application is respectfully requested.
2. Applicant specifically emphasizes that this statement, and/or the act of identifying this information, is not to be construed as an admission that all or any of it is prior art to the specific invention disclosed and claimed. Also nothing in this statement is to be construed as a representation that this is the only material information to be found, or the best. If additional material information is discovered in the future, a prompt submission will be made to fulfill applicants continuing duty of disclosure under 37 CFR 1.56.

Claim Rejections

3. After consideration of the rejections made by the examiner and review of the claims of my patent application I have realized that my new invention, clearly shown in the drawings submitted in the application, was not explained or defined clearly in the written section of the application. Additionally, as stated above, new information recently discovered and brought to my attention by the patent office in relation to

another patent application that I have pending makes it even more important to clearly and accurately define the improvements to be found in this new invention. Therefore I am Amending the Claims to delineate the advances and limitations in my new invention (see "AMENDMENT TO CLAIMS" attached).

4. **Regarding Claim 1**, The rejection citing Price is in error because Price uses an ellipsoid reflector 2 and spherical reflector 4. My invention uses parabolic reflectors 20 & 22 as now plainly stated in the amended claims and clearly shown in Fig. 1, 2, 3, and 4. The newly disclosed *Shikama et al* (US 5,142,387) does show a dual reflector system using parabolic reflectors but does not teach or suggest a round circular aperture as now plainly stated in the amended claims and clearly shown in Fig. 1, 2, 3, and 4 of my application. Shikama was obsessed with, and claimed, only a rectangular opening which was more efficient than what had been done in the past but is not as efficient as the circular opening of my invention. While it could be argued that circular apertures have been used in many types of lighting fixtures before, there is a drastic difference with my new invention. All round or circular apertures reduce the amount of light passing through the aperture as the aperture decreases in size. This reduction is in both the number of rays or volume of light passing through the aperture and in the intensity and concentration of light contained in said beam of light energy. I repeat, all previously known and made apertures function in this manner. I am disclosing in this patent that by using this type of reflector system and a circular aperture for the light to exit it is possible, for the first time, to create an aperture where the light energy exiting is

not decreased when the aperture is made smaller but actually increases in concentration and intensity. Additionally, the number of rays or volume of light in the beam of light energy through the aperture remains substantially constant. This discovery is not taught or suggested by Shikama or any other prior art.

5. **Regarding Claim 2-6**, these claims should now be allowed since they modify new art, **Claim 1**. Additionally, **Claim 2** and **Claim 3** provide two variations of the new invention that produce two very different beams of light energy. **Claim 2** produces a beam of light consisting of primarily parallel rays as shown in Fig. 2. and **Claim 3** produces a beam of light consisting of rays radiating outward in a cone with no parallel rays as shown in Fig. 1. An invention with these capabilities is not taught or suggested by Shikama or any other prior art.

6. **Regarding Claim 7-17**, The rejection citing Price in view of Bishop et al is in error because Price uses an ellipsoid reflector 2 and spherical reflector 4. My invention uses parabolic reflectors 20 & 22 as now plainly stated in the amended claims and clearly shown in Fig. 1, 2, 3, and 4. In view of these facts Bishop does not apply. The newly disclosed *Shikama et al* (5,142,387) does show a dual reflector system using parabolic reflectors but does not teach or suggest a round circular aperture as now plainly stated in the amended claims and clearly shown in Fig. 1, 2, 3, and 4 of my application. Shikama claimed only a rectangular opening which was more efficient than what had been done in the past but is not as efficient as the circular opening of my

invention. While it could be argued that circular apertures have been used in many types of lighting fixtures before, there is a drastic difference with my new invention. All round or circular apertures reduce the amount of light passing through the aperture as the aperture decreases in size. This reduction is in both the number of rays or volume of light passing through the aperture and in the intensity and concentration of light contained in said beam of light energy. I am disclosing in this patent that by using this type of reflector system and a circular aperture for the light to exit it is possible, for the first time, to create an aperture where the light energy exiting is not decreased when the aperture is made smaller but actually increases in concentration and intensity. Additionally, the number of rays or volume of light in the beam of light energy through the aperture remains substantially constant. This discovery is not taught or suggested by Shikama or any other prior art.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. **Claims 18-23** are left as is and should not be affected by the new disclosure.

Conclusion

8. These facts are what make my invention work and also what make it unique therefore my independent **Claim 1, Claim 7, and Claim 13** should be allowed. The remaining dependent claims should be allowed because they modify or limit new art (**Claim 1, Claim 7, and Claim 13**) and therefore are also new art.

9. Please contact me if you need anything else or if I can help in any way. I can be reached on my cell phone at 270 210 1608.

Respectfully Yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Randy Wimberly", is written over a horizontal line.

Randal L. Wimberly

November 13, 2008